

REMARKS

Claims 1-27, 41 and 43-47 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 12, 13, 15, 17, 26, 27, 41, 43 and 47 have been amended by the present Amendment. Amended claims 1, 12, 13, 15, 17, 26, 27, 41, 43 and 47 do not introduce any new subject matter.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner objects to claims 5-7, 13-23 and 25 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, and indicates that claims 5-7, 13-23 and 25 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base and any intervening claims.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in claims 5-7, 13-23 and 25.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the Examiner's objection to claims 5-7, 13-23 and 25 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. In response to the Examiner's objection, Applicants have canceled claim 6 and rewritten independent claim 1 to incorporate the allowable subject matter of claim 6.

Therefore, in light of the amendment made to independent claim 1, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection to claims 5-7, 13-23 and 25.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 1-4 and 8-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,753,551 ("Cheng").

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference."

Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim." Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989); M.P.E.P. § 2131.

Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to include the limitations of allowable claim 6. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Cheng and is condition for allowance. Claims 2-4 and 8-9 ultimately depend from claim 1, which, for the reasons stated hereinabove, is submitted not to be anticipated by the cited reference. For at least those very same reasons, claims 2-4 and 8-9 are also submitted not to be anticipated by the cited reference.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has not shown how Cheng anticipates the first and second portions of the pixel electrode connected to each other, as recited in claim 2.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-4 and 8-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and that claims 1-4 and 8-9 are in condition for allowance.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claim 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,600,539 ("Song").

Applicants have amended claim 41 to include the limitations of allowable claim 23. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 41 is not anticipated by Song and is condition for allowance.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and that claim 41 is in condition for

allowance.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 10-12, 24 and 26-28 as being unpatentable over Cheng.

As stated above, Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to include the limitations of allowable claim 6. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is patentable over Cheng and is condition for allowance. Claims 10-12, 24 and 26-28 ultimately depend from claim 1, which, for the reasons stated hereinabove, is submitted to be patentable over the cited reference. For at least those very same reasons, claims 10-12, 24 and 26-28 are also submitted to be patentable over the cited reference.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 10-12, 24 and 26-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and that claims 10-12, 24 and 26-28 are in condition for allowance.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 43-47 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Song.

As stated above, Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to include the limitations of allowable claim 6. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is patentable over Song and is condition for allowance. Claims 43-47 ultimately depend from claim 1, which, for the reasons stated hereinabove, is submitted to be patentable over the cited reference. For at least those very same reasons, claims 43-47 are also submitted to be patentable over the cited reference.


Further, Applicants submit that the rejection of claims 43-47 under 35 U.S.C. §

103(a) was improper, since claims 43-47 ultimately depended from allowable claim 6.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 43-47 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and that claims 43-47 are in condition for allowance.

An early and favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner has any further questions or comments, the Examiner may telephone Applicants' Attorney to reach a prompt disposition of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Michael F. Morano", is written over a horizontal line.

Michael F. Morano
Reg. No. 44,952
Attorney for Applicants

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, NY 11797
(516) 692-8888